

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 070

JC 690 015

By-Harper, William A.

"Like It Is": Report of a Workshop for New Junior College Presidents and Their Wives (Los Angeles, July 14-20, 1968).

California Univ., Los Angeles. Junior Coll. Leadership Program.

Pub Date Oct 68

Note-26p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.40

Descriptors-*Administrator Role, Attitudes, *Chief Administrators, *Junior Colleges, *Presidents, Workshops

At this workshop, opinions were expressed on the value of certain attributes of a president, such as: his personal qualities of self-esteem, intelligence, patience, and idealism; his role as an example to school and community; his integrity and human warmth; his interest in young people; an ability to work hard under pressure without loss of identity; intellectual leadership, both on and off campus; managerial leadership to encourage, inspire, and direct others; ability to delegate authority; willingness to make decisions; agreement with his school's philosophy and practices; and a professional alertness to trends and innovations. There were also different ideas on the role of the president's wife: she should be much in the background, but accept responsibility when appropriate; serve as a leader of other women when necessary; understand education in general; see that her husband's home life provides respite from his pressures and problems; calmly accept public scrutiny and even criticism; refrain from speaking out on college operations; take part in faculty wives' activities; attend to any social obligations that create or contribute to good college and community relations; be concerned with her public appearance, attitude, and conduct; involve herself discreetly in cultural and civic affairs; be socially aware and flexible; retain her individuality. The president as perceived by other groups, current problems of junior colleges in general, and president/faculty relationships were also discussed. (HH)

ED026070

JC 690 015

**"LIKE
IT IS"**



A Report of a Workshop for New Junior College Presidents and Their Wives / by William A. Harper

Sponsored by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program

ublished by the Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles / October, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"LIKE IT IS"

*Report of a Workshop
for
New Junior College Presidents
and
Their Wives
By William A. Harper
July 14-20, 1968*

Sponsored by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program

LIKE IT IS

With the current establishment of seventy and more new junior colleges each year and with the sharp expansion of existing colleges, unprecedented numbers of new junior college administrators are required. As a result of this situation, many two-year colleges find it necessary to appoint presidents who have had little or no background of junior college experience. These administrators may come from government or industry, from public schools or from universities. They may be highly skilled administrators and have notable capacity for educational leadership. Because of a lack of experience in the junior college they report, however, that as new administrators they face special problems and difficulties.

During the 1967-68 university year I corresponded with more than one hundred junior college presidents (many of them now with long and successful tenure) who, at the time they became chief administrators, had had little or no junior college experience.

In response to a query from me all of these presidents recommended holding a workshop for new administrators. And with almost unanimity, they urged that wives be included in the workshop.

As a consequence of this correspondence a decision was made to hold in July, 1968 an invitational one-week

workshop under the sponsorship of the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program for new junior college presidents and their wives.

William Harper, Director of Public Relations, American Association of Junior Colleges, was invited to be the reporter-recorder of the Workshop. When Mr. Harper completed his report it became clear that it should be made available to a wider readership than the membership of the workshop.


The UCLA Junior College Leadership Program is, therefore, pleased to publish Mr. Harper's report and to make it available to junior college administrators and others who are interested in the operation and functioning of the community junior college.¹

Los Angeles
September 30, 1968

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

¹Readers may also be interested in the proceedings of the national conference on the junior college president, which was held during and as a part of the Workshop: B. Lamar Johnson, editor — "The Junior College President."

Occasional Report Number 13 from the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1969. This report may be ordered (\$2.00) from the Student Store, University of California, Los Angeles.



THE ACTION

"Like It Is" is a report on a workshop for twenty-three new junior college presidents and their wives, conducted July 14 to 20 at the University of California, Los Angeles. The action was in the hands of the UCLA Junior College Leadership Center staff, supported by a special grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Purpose of the workshop was to give the new presidents, men who had been in their leadership positions for two years or less, an opportunity to exchange ideas and information about their jobs, to take exercises in decision-making and behavioral problems, and to pick up some ideas from other leaders in higher education, both four-year and two-year college representatives. Wives were happily included in the program because it was recognized by the workshop planning staff that the president's wife is expected to take an active role in community and college life, whether she wants to or not. Moreover, it was hoped that by participating in the program, the ladies would come away with a better understanding of the president's job, the frustrations, the joys, the responsibilities that he daily faces. With such an understanding, she presumably would be better able to play her part as a sympathetic, helpful silent partner.

In addition to participating in exclusive sessions for new presidents and their wives, the group also attended sessions of a National Conference on the Junior College President July 15-17, also conducted by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Center staff at UCLA. A number of distinguished educators presented papers on a wide range of topics that fit appropriately into the framework of the workshop. While reference to some of the comments made at the national conference are included in this report as they relate to the workshop, no effort has been made to

summarize or cover in full the proceedings of the meeting. The papers presented at the conference will be edited and prepared for distribution later this year.

Another highlight of the workshop included a visit to El Camino College, a large comprehensive community college in Torrance, California. The president and staff of the college discussed the institution's program, and administrative practices, and some of the problems faced by the large community college. Workshop participants were also given an exercise in how a president acts and reacts through an "in-basket" session with President Stuart Marsee of El Camino.

Dr. Charles Ferguson of UCLA led the wives and presidents down the twisting path of the behavioral scientist in one of the concluding sessions of the workshop. He tried to show them, through their participation in various experiences, something about the problems of "relationships, human relations and human systems." They came out of it feeling like aardvarks.

In the following pages, an attempt is made to report in greater detail on what went on at the workshop. I will not try, however, to provide a verbatim account of what happened. That would be impossible since the sessions were not recorded except through the shorthand of the journalist.

It is hoped that what is brought out here, impressions of the session, will be of benefit to other college presidents, whether new or old, as well as to those who participated in the workshop.

THE LEADERS

A team made up of Dr. and Mrs. B. Lamar Johnson and Dr. and Mrs. John Lombardi led the workshop, providing the necessary direction and inspiration for lively, absorbing exchange among the guests. Spirits never flagged under what should have been an arduous schedule, yet never was. The directors had charted a fast-paced but varied program which kept interest and enthusiasm at a high level.

6 Dr. Johnson served as the catalyst for the group — keeping them to the schedule, insuring that discussions did not go too far afield, and providing backup information for some of the questions that were posed. Director of the Junior College Leadership Center and professor of higher education at UCLA, Johnson can count scores of men and women who have studied under him at the University, many now serving in high administrative positions in junior colleges across the country. He is a man on the go — and has been a leading advocate for innovation and experimentation at the junior college level.

Dr. Johnson has studied innovative practices in junior colleges, and has published on the subject. He recently completed the manuscript for a book on new developments in junior college teaching. This year, a new book on innovation bearing his name will be brought out by Glencoe Press.*

Agnes Johnson, the other half of the Johnson team, is an innovator in her own right, holds a master's degree in art from UCLA. She is a creator of paintings, sculpture, and ceramics works. Mrs. Johnson has been a member of the Western Training Laboratory. She has also traveled with her husband on his expeditions to junior colleges, and has participated in conferences and meetings dealing with junior college education. She knows the scene.

*B. Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation Expanding*, Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.



Dr. John Lombardi is a statesman in junior college administration. Assistant superintendent of the Los Angeles Junior College District, he has major responsibility for the health and welfare of the eight colleges in that district. Before being "kicked upstairs," as he puts it, Dr. Lombardi was president of Los Angeles City College for many years.

Dr. Lombardi's "statements" to faculty and other junior college presidents over the years have become classics in junior college literature. In addition to the local and state leadership that he has exerted, Dr. Lombardi serves on the Board of Directors of the American Association of Junior Colleges and is a former chairman of the AAJC Commission on Administration.

Mrs. Lombardi is a quiet lady who believes that a president's wife should be much in the background, though accepting responsibility when it seems appropriate, serving as a leader of women when necessary. She understands something about education as a former teacher and because of her years, since 1955, in the position of the college president's wife. She has been a librarian, English teacher and counselor, and holds degrees from Pomona College and Columbia University.

Bernard Luskin, occupational education specialist at Orange Coast College and a doctoral student at UCLA, assisted in the management of the workshop.

This, then, was the team that conducted the workshop. To know these men and women is to better relate the objectives of the program to what actually happened.

THE PARTICIPANTS

The presidents and their wives came from Alabama and they came from Washington. They came from Florida, Texas, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, Georgia, Iowa,

Nebraska, Oregon, Kansas, Canada, North Carolina, Illinois, Kentucky, and Minnesota.

Some of the new presidents represented new colleges, some that aren't even open yet. One of the group hurried back to his community at the close of the workshop to help break ground for a new campus. He happened to be the youngest of the group, only 27 years old, perhaps the youngest college president in the country.

There were colleges that had been something else, like a branch campus of a university, or a technical institution. One president billed his college as an experimental institution where no one was hired who was not willing to innovate and experiment.

There was one college represented which enrolls more than 12,000 students but doesn't even have a campus. There were small colleges and large colleges, some institutions located in rural areas, others in metropolitan centers. Major criterion for selection of the presidents was that they would have had two years or less experience as presidents of junior colleges, or no background in junior college work before they became presidents. One president had come directly from industry where he had been employed for 11 years. He had made a radical change in his career orientation at the age of 40. Several of the presidents had come from positions in four-year colleges and universities, some from administrative and others from faculty positions. One had been a university vice president, two had been university deans.

A number of the participants had had experience in public school education. Some had been school teachers at one time during their careers.

Ages of the presidents ranged from 27 to 56, though most were in their forties. A majority of the men had earned

doctor's degrees, and all of them had at least a master's degree. Most had taken advanced study over and above their formal degrees.

The wives were well equipped and oriented professionally and educationally for life in a junior college setting. There were several former nurses and teachers among them, and some were still teaching. Most of the wives had attended college and earned degrees. Several could list master's degrees among their credits. Some are still taking college courses. One presidential wife is a senior student in a university where her daughter is also a senior. There was even a former candidate for Mrs. America among them.

If there was any common thread running through the conclave, it was a universal feeling of concern for expanding and improving opportunity for education beyond high school. Not dedication in the religious missionary sense, but a genuine belief in the worthwhileness of their thing.

8

THE PRESIDENTS, THEIR WIVES AND HOW THEY VIEW THEMSELVES AND THEIR JOBS

What do new junior college presidents and their wives think about? What are their chief concerns? Problems? How do they look at the people with whom they must share responsibility for operating an educational institution—students, faculty, trustees, the community at large? The 49 participants in the UCLA workshop had a number of opportunities to reveal themselves to themselves.

SOME WIFELY VIEWS OF THE PRESIDENT

"The junior college president is first of all a person. He will not succeed in his job unless he can be himself. He likes people, he is intelligent, he has patience—yet knows when to push. He believes in his job and does not think of it as just a stepping stone to higher things. He can work with

people, delegate responsibility, and inspire those who work with him."



"The president is idealistic, and constructive in his attitude—the kind of person who wants to leave the world better than he found it. Life erodes him and he is less sure as life goes on."

"A junior college president is typically in his 40's, perhaps having had some years experience as a dean, but in most cases in public school education. He is extroverted, gregarious and physically attractive. Usually married and with children."

"The junior college president has to have broad shoulders to carry the load that is thrust upon him. A broad mind to be able to take every faculty member's words to heart."

"A junior college president is an example to the school, community, associations of all kinds, of a knowledgeable human being. One who can be consulted in areas of human relationships and world affairs."

"A junior college president is a man of character, with an interest in young people. He needs above all patience!"

"A junior college president is a person who must constantly be aware of the community's needs. He must be friendly to those in the community that help the college—but should not necessarily always agree with them. He must say and do the same thing he says he will do. And be a hard worker."

"A college president has many roles to play in his community . . . A junior college president is a person who must constantly be aware of the community's needs . . . Mr. President is a composite of all the best qualities of everyone . . . A junior college president is an individual who seeks a separate identity but finds it difficult because of pressures within the college and his community . . ."

Against these theories of what a junior college president is—or is not—how does the president's wife view her role? Recognizing that colleges may be different in terms of size, location, and in approach to the job to be done, there are commonalities in the role of the wife which can be observed. A check list goes something like this:

- A college president's wife should have as her first goal that of looking after the health and well-being of her husband, understanding the pressures and problems as well as the hopes and aspirations that may be a part of his daily routine. Providing a good home life is essential.
- A president's wife never loses her "cool." Because she is the wife of the head of an important community institution, she must be prepared to face up to public scrutiny, and perhaps even criticism, with understanding and calm.
- A president's wife, on the other hand, should stay in the background in terms of the management and operation of the college. She must not put herself in a position of speaking for the president or the institution on matters having to do with actual operations.
- A president's wife should, if invited, take part in the activities of faculty wives' organization, again depending on the size and orientation of the institution. In general, she should avoid campus leadership roles in the formal sense.
- A president's wife has certain social obligations, both in relation to the college and to the community. She does not have to be a social creature, but she should do her share toward creating good college and community relations.

- A president's wife should be concerned about her appearance, her public attitude, her conduct. While these things may seem trivial, all too often she is looked to as a pacesetter in dress and style in her community.
- A president's wife, while not putting herself in the position of being the town do-gooder, should look for opportunity to involve herself in cultural and civic affairs. Usually, she will find herself in this role without really trying. But there must be a balance between the wife's involvement in college versus community affairs.
- A president's wife has to have her own bag. Do her own thing. In addition to those responsibilities which befall her as the result of her position, she should also allow time and opportunity to pursue things she likes to do, whether it be horseback riding, painting, writing, or gardening.

10 Some other thoughts and pointers came out of discussions among the wives:

You've got to be a sounding board for your husband, not get so involved that you cannot devote time to him . . . We are public relations people for the college—and must maintain positive, optimistic, forward-looking attitudes toward the college family . . . We can't be gossips . . . The presidential wife has to be herself . . . An awareness and feeling for individuals is essential . . . She has to be extremely flexible to adjust quickly to so many different situations . . .

Barbara W. Morgan, wife of Don A. Morgan, a president, made this point in a speech:

"Though recognizable types of wives of presidents exist, including the 'cross to bear' type who arrived on the scene of action unwillingly, and the 'confused and

overcome' type, who is amazed by all the attention she gets, there is a need for the 'professional' who, upon arriving at the scene, determines through study and observation the degree of help she can be—to the president and to the college. She can influence a college by never going near it. She can also do some good, if she is inclined and if she is able."

THE PRESIDENTS VIEW THEIR ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Despite the problems that were raised, and the cloudiness of some issues in higher education today, the new presidents seemed confident and sure of themselves as they looked at their jobs. While there may have been some uncertainty as to how to proceed on some matters, in general they appeared to have a plan and approach that they believed to be viable.

Some had the whole bit to worry about. That is, they were not only new presidents but new presidents of brand new colleges. They were concerned about finding people—staff and faculty, about facilities planning, curriculum development, financing, and all the other things that go into the making of an institution of higher education. Surprising, perhaps, but none seemed especially harrassed or overwhelmed by the task. Maybe that's why they got to be college presidents.

The workshop, of course, was not designed for the study and examination of general campus planning. Yet, through informal discussions at social gatherings and in UCLA's Rieber Hall dormitory rooms (that's where they stayed), undoubtedly a few problems were resolved or at the least, hope of solution was found.

Here's how, in part, at least, the new president looks at himself and his role.

- The new president must be an intellectual leader, in his college and his community. He will not otherwise gain the respect of his faculty, his students or other elements of the community.
- The president must be a good manager, particularly of people. He must be willing to listen, to sympathize, to encourage and inspire—but he must also know how and when to be firm.
- The president must know how and when to make decisions. He cannot pass the buck on important matters.
- The president at the same time must know how to delegate and to whom to delegate. Otherwise, he will be buried under a morass of paper and detail.
- The president, while performing as a manager or ad-

ministrator, must also recognize that he also has an obligation to serve—the students, the faculty, the college population.

- The president must know his institution, its objectives, its purposes, its programs if he is to interpret all aspects of the institution to his board on the one hand and the constituents of the college on the other.
- The president must be professionally keen, alert to new trends in education, abreast of innovations and ideas that can be adapted to his own college.
- The president, despite all this, must recognize that he is not a superman. Like his wife, he must also have his own bag, his own thing to do that removes him from the stress and strain of the daily routine.







THEORIZING ABOUT HOW OTHERS MIGHT SEE THEM

Not content to simply look at themselves through their own eyes, the new presidents (joined by their wives) theorized about how other groups see them. They formed groups which assumed roles representing various segments of the college society, again under the direction of the behavioral scientist. Whether they were right or wrong about the views of others is perhaps beside the point. But their theories could have impact on their relationships within the college. Here's what came out of the role-playing session:

Business Office—You don't include us in your planning and policy making. We are treated as second-class citizens, concerned primarily with bookkeeping and maintenance. We have a nasty role.

Teaching Faculty—Why can't we evaluate the administrators. They evaluate us. We want the status that our positions deserve, even down to name designations for parking spaces.

Deans and Department Chairmen—We're just here to help and advise.

Student Council—Nobody pays any attention to us. The business office dictates our budget. We want to be able to evaluate faculty, be represented in college policy making, and have some impact on the development of curriculum.

Non-Academic Personnel—We want recognition. Nobody knows we exist except when they need some menial work done. We want to be participative in the affairs of the college.

Black Student Organization—If we are not included in the affairs of the college, then give us a separate

place. Everybody mouths equality but no one practices it. Whitey better shape up or we are going to burn the place down.

Board of Trustees—After hearing the above, the board wanted to call an emergency meeting with the president.

Granted this was somewhat tongue in cheek, it did give some insight into attitudes that might relate to presidential relationships. The lesson, apparently, was that the president has to know and understand the perceptions of those with whom he works if he is to assure a leadership which is expected of him, and, in particular, to bring his insights and abilities to bear on problems and attitudes that affect the objectives of the institution.

DECISION-MAKING AND THE IN-BASKET

What strange things come across a president's desk. At a session at El Camino College, led by El Camino President Stuart Marsee and his staff, the new presidents took a look at messages, complaints, requests and other matters that typically accumulate on the chief administrator's desk. They took time to describe how they might act on the array of items that appear in the in-basket.

In some cases, they were far apart as a group on how they might handle a given item. Some, for example, seemed to feel that a call or letter from a member of the board of trustees on any matter, no matter how trivial, should receive instant attention. Others would treat the board member's call in the same way that they would process any other matter—and when they could get to it. All seemed to agree that much of that which collects in an in-basket should be delegated to other members of the administrative team. Here are some of the items that appeared in the basket:

- A faculty member wants a private office because she must counsel with a number of her students, and because her two office-mates are inconsiderate about their smoking and the ventilation in the present office.
- A questionnaire about opportunities for Negroes at the college.
- Protests from citizens about an allegedly left-wing speaker who is to appear on the campus.
- Letter from a citizen complaining about liberal tendencies of the college.
- Memo from a teacher reporting a case of indecent exposure in her evening class – asking what action could be taken to prevent such incidents in the future.
- Complaint against an official of the college for allegedly conducting personal business on school property.
- Residents protesting shrubbery being used in the new landscaping program of the college.
- Letter from a former student complaining about a teacher.
- Memo requesting lounge furniture for the student center.
- Call from a board member reminding the president that the college should participate in an annual town parade.
- Call from a member of the Board asking the college to make an exception in regard to enrolling a friend's daughter after the admissions deadline.
- Complaint about the examination schedule of a teacher.
- Invitation to attend an annual community dinner.

- Memo from the dean of students indicating that an older student who had been disqualified from class because of his low grade average would be pounding on the president's door.
- Dean of students points up problems of student parking violations – wants help on how to enforce parking regulations.
- Invitation to speak to a local civic club.
- A memo from the chairman of the speech department complimenting one of his teachers on her good work.
- Report of a theft and accusation of a student.
- Complaint about a teacher's off-campus activities in regard to his role as a hearing officer for a local police commission. In that capacity, he supported a local restaurant's right to stage a strip-tease show at lunch-time.
- Dean of Instruction raises a question about the violation of college policy by a teacher in his use of a certain textbook.

15

THE EXPERTS TELL IT LIKE IT IS

What new presidents, it was plain to see and hear, are thinking about these days are the issues that faculty, administration, trustees and all others in higher education are thinking about. The faculty and the student in institutional governance. Accommodating the disadvantaged. Black power. Social change and unrest. Few, if any, of the colleges represented at the meeting had experienced violence – and the presidents could only hope that they would be spared the kind of conflict which has taken place elsewhere.

They did not go away with ready-made solutions to these or any other problems. No formulas were devised.



But what the workshop seemed to do was to bring about a greater awareness of what must be done if the community college is to make its proper contribution to society and to individuals. If there was one thread woven into the warp and woof of the workshop fabric, it was that "you've got to see it, tell it, like it really is." "You've got to face up to reality." The old academic facades of tradition and convention are being torn down. The junior college president, since his institution is supposed to be a major community force, must perhaps even take leadership in tearing down the facade.

All issues have to be considered in the light of certain trends in education as related to the junior and community college, according to B. Lamar Johnson, in his presentation to the presidents. These include, he suggested:

- First, the junior college is assuming major responsibility for preparing students for upper division work at universities and other institutions.
- Second, the junior college is assuming major responsibility for technical-vocational education.
- Third, there is a definite trend toward the compre-

hensive junior college which includes in a single institution preparation for employment and education for transfer.

- Fourth, the junior college is an open-door college.
- Fifth, guidance is recognized as an important responsibility and, according to some educators, a goal of the junior college.
- And, sixth, the junior college is a community college.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE FACULTY: TWO VIEWS

There was a contagion of concern about the relationship of the college president and other administrators to the faculty. There was fairly general agreement that changes in plans of governance had come, and would continue to take place. Speakers at the national conference and the leaders of the workshop, as well as the participants themselves, without question gave this issue priority attention and serious consideration. If the new college presidents were not awakened to the problem before arriving in Los Angeles, they had to be when they left the UCLA campus.

17





Dr. John Lombardi, speaking from the standpoint of a long-time administrator, made some telling points on the subject of president-faculty relations:

"It is natural in a review of the relationship between the president and the faculty, in a period of rising faculty influence in the governance of junior colleges, to become discouraged or to feel that the president is losing his position. Conflict seems to be replacing harmony. The one-happy-family idea has disappeared, assuming that it ever existed. The changes that have taken place and that may continue to take place are not easy to accept for no matter how democratically inclined a president may be he will resist the efforts of the faculty, especially as they are pushed by faculty organizations, to deprive him of his leadership role.

"A president, reluctant as he may be to give up any of his prerogatives, cannot resist being carried along by the currents . . . The faculty are seeing to that. But as long as he is guiding the raft, he can avoid the large boulders or prevent it from capsizing . . .

"Though today's revolution may force some presidents to resign rather than submit to the 'usurpation' of their prerogatives, accommodation is taking place. More important, the roles of president and faculty are being modified, not reversed. The president still administers and leads, the faculty still teach. We know that in Chicago and in Dearborn and Macomb County, Michigan, where faculty have obtained collective agreements, the presidents still function. We know that in many universities in which academic senates have great responsibility in the governance of the universities, presidents and chancellors have not been replaced by faculty . . . These examples should reassure presidents that in the junior colleges the essential relationships between the president and the faculty will not be fundamentally changed . . .

"As the number of accommodations increases and as the fears of takeover by the senate or negotiating council of AFT or NEA prove unfounded, the spectre of doom will vanish. Aggressiveness and extreme demands by the faculty will also be moderated as faculty get security through tenure, good salaries and fringe benefits, recognition of their right to bargain on issues, and reasonable opportunity for participation in administration.

"Though the faculty may wish to participate, it is unlikely that they will want the responsibility of administering and it is not possible for a multitude to assume the role of leadership. Faculty organizations, like labor organizations, will lose their reason for being if they become administrative organs because then they will be the antagonists of their own members, they will be the producers of grievances. Unless we experience a form of sovietization, it is likely that demands on the president will be made just short of usurping his functions as administrator and leader."

Reasonable opportunity for participation in administration may be a hang-up for administrators and faculty alike. Whether administrators and faculty can ever agree on what is "reasonable opportunity for participation" is a moot question.

It seems likely that Louis Reiss, a faculty member at Pasadena City College and president of the California Junior College Faculty Association, had something else in mind when he discussed "The Faculty and the Junior College President." Some of his hearers thought him militant when he said that "many administrators give only lip service to human dignity in their treatment of faculty. Faculty will participate in college governance. Administrators may as well adjust to that fact of life. There must be shared authority soon — and there must be limitless faculty influence."



His thesis: that the evolving relationship of the faculty and the president must be a partnership, and that this recognizes the faculty as a part of institutional government and implies a formal organizational structure operating on the basis of shared responsibility. Mr. Reiss made some other points:

- The president, through his administrative staff, often rules as the benevolent autocrat of a generally conservative institution. Faculties form pseudo-democratic structures which give the external appearance of participation in government.
- There is usually very little communication directly between the faculty and board, or between administration, faculty and the board, which hampers involvement of faculty in decision making.
- Teachers are voiceless outside the classroom because administrators have centralized control and often govern by mimeograph.

The solution: there should be a faculty oriented administrative structure directly responsible to the faculty with presidential approval—and having decision-making responsibility in a wide range of categories—from development of the budget, to educational and curriculum policy making, and to appointment of all non-instructional administrative personnel, including the office of president.

The presidents heard more than they could possibly absorb at the National Conference on the Junior College President. In addition to the presentations by Dr. Lombardi and Mr. Reiss, they were given statistics, advice, inspiration and much wisdom. They heard more about the roles and responsibilities of junior college presidents than they probably cared to know, particularly since they had some very good ideas of their own on the subject.

They learned, from the lofty perch of the president of the California Junior College Student Government Association, that junior college students are going to be heard from more forcefully and more frequently. We want power, we want to be recognized, we want to help guide our institutions, said Clinton B. Mayers. You couldn't help but feel that the students would probably find themselves with more responsibility than they now have and can handle.

HOLLOMAN ON THE PRESIDENCY

The new presidents got further counsel on what is expected of them from another new president, J. Herbert Holloman. A former federal official, Holloman became a university president for the first time early in 1968. Or, as he put it, he was asked to prepare to become the president of the University of Oklahoma. He was given about a year to make ready for the presidency in what has been hailed by educators as a very unusual experiment in higher education leadership development. Holloman was certain of one thing. There is no single route leading to a presidency. He didn't buy the notion, often expressed, that a man has to be an academician or an educationist, to have x number of years in sublevels of educational administration, in order to make his way into a college or university presidency. He said you've got to have style, creative leadership ability, imagination, and a willingness to listen on the one hand and to say it like it is on the other. While calling the presidency the most interesting occupation of all, he warned that the chance of success is small. The chance of survival negligible. Here are some of his criteria for administrative leadership:

- The college president should be free from personal fear and personal ambition. It doesn't matter what he does as an individual but what his aims are and how he achieves them.



- The college president must set a style. The way people see you, the way you tell it, is important. A college president should be his own sort of man. The style of the man will be reflected in the institution.
- The college president has to listen. People don't speak out because they feel nobody wants to listen to them. Students, faculty, the man in the street, everybody ought to be listened to.
- The college president must understand the nature of the society. It is impossible to lead an institution if you don't know the hopes, aspirations of the people it serves. The institution lives in society.
- The college president must understand the nature of the institution, not only as it is viewed from the inside but from other standpoints. The president who comes up through the ranks may have a very distorted view of his own institution.
- The president has always got to be a leader of change. He, and the institution he represents, must be the first to respond to change in society.

SOME FURTHER HOLLOMANISMS:

"Whenever I find that I am in a position which makes it impossible for me to read three books in a week, I know that I am either in the wrong position or mismanaging my time."

"A common difficulty in preparing to be a president is to assume that somebody knows what institutional aims and objectives may be. The single most important error is to assume that somebody knows what the hell the objectives are . . .

"The organization charts are wrong. They are upside down. The man at the top serves those at the bottom . . . His

first job is to prepare to be a human being, then become a college president . . ."

SUMMING UP

Charles E. Young, chancellor of UCLA, perhaps summed up the message of the program for new junior college presidents in his few remarks.

"Our job as college and university presidents is to serve society. If we don't recognize the facts of life, understand the revolution that is going on around us, then we will fail to lead."

The value of the workshop can only be reflected in what happens on the various campuses represented as the presidents and their wives carry out their functions and responsibilities. An attempt was made, however, to secure some evaluative data from the participants. All forty-three rated the workshop "excellent" or "very good." Forty recommended holding similar workshops for junior college deans and their wives, as well as similar programs for other new presidents and their wives. Here are some of the comments made by individual participants:

"A grand experiment it was to bring in and involve the wives. This added a welcome new dimension to our work, and each family returned home a more effective working team. I commend those who conceived this idea."

"With such an emphasis on change and the demands that this places upon new, young college presidents, it has always been strange to me that we did not do more to educate our new presidents with respect to their roles and responsibilities. The workshop was one effective way of resolving this difficulty."

And that's the way it was.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS*—NEW PRESIDENTS AND THEIR WIVES

Jack K. and Mary Ellen Carlton, Macon Junior College,
Macon, Georgia

W. Byron and Peggy Causey, Alexander City State Junior
College, Alexander City, Alabama

E. Phillip and Mary Comer, Southeastern Community Col-
lege, Whiteville, North Carolina

Joseph C. and Jane L. Deaton, Southeastern Illinois College,
Harrisburg, Illinois

Ed K. and Ayleen Erickson, Seattle Community College,
Seattle, Washington

Henry C. J. and Evelyn M. Evans, Somerset County College,
Somerville, New Jersey

Mel and Lucy Everingham, Area XV Community College,
Ottumwa, Iowa

24 J. C. and Frances Falkenstine, Southeast Community Col-
lege, Cumberland, Kentucky

Russell H. and Ella Graham, Coffeyville Community Junior
College, Coffeyville, Kansas

W. Ardell and Wilma G. Haines, Allegany Community Col-
lege, Cumberland, Maryland

Herbert M. and Donna R. Jelley, Jefferson Community Col-
lege, Louisville, Kentucky

Paul and Hilja A. Lowery, Area XI Community College,
Ankeny, Iowa

Hugh, Jr. and Evelyn Mills, Gainesville Junior College,
Oakwood, Georgia

Donald L. and Dee Newport, Platte College, Columbus,
Nebraska

Marion O. and Mary Oppelt, Clover Park Community
College, Tacoma, Washington

Donald E. and Jo Ann Puyear, Dabney S. Lancaster Com-
munity College, Clifton Forge, Virginia

William J. and Muriel Sample, Cumberland County Col-
lege, Vineland, New Jersey

C. D. and Shirley Stewart, Lethbridge Junior College, Leth-
bridge, Alberta, Canada

Richard and Gladys F. Strahan, Lee College, Baytown, Texas

Woodrow and Rae Sugg, Caston College, Gastonia, North
Carolina

John W. and Dee Torgelson, Willmar State Junior College,
Willmar, Minnesota

Fred W. and Dorothy Turner, Tallahassee Junior College,
Tallahassee, Florida

Richard and Jean White, Shoreline Community College,
Seattle, Washington

- Also participating was Edward Cohen, director, division
of two-year colleges, Department of Higher Education,
State of New Jersey.

A Report of a Workshop for New Junior College Presidents and Their Wives/by William A. Harper